

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 67, 69 to 73, and 75 to 77 are pending in this application, claim 74 is cancelled, claim 77 is new, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 47 and 64 are currently amended.

5 The current amendments are supported in the application as filed on page 1 line 33 to page 2 line 1, reading "In a preferred embodiment of the invention, the commands are directed to actions, other than page retrieval. Examples of actions include, modifying files, copying data and executing programs".

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

10 Claims 64-67 are rejected as it is unclear to the Examiner if the limitation "which" refers to the browser or to the WWW page. Claim 64 is currently amended to replace the word "which" with "which browser". Therefore, the rejection is moot.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

15 Claims 1-8, 11-51, and 53-67 stand rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Estabrook, in view of Lee. Estabrook teaches how to use Microsoft Internet Explorer 4, and Lee teaches that it is possible to search the Internet directly from the address bar. Applicant currently amend the claims, and explains below why each of the independent claims is patentable over the combination of Estabrook and Lee.

20 Claim 1 is now limited to a method, wherein the command is directed to an action of copying data and/or modifying files. Estabrook teaches navigating the user's PC and Lee teaches searching the Internet, but neither teaches or suggests an act directed to copying data or modifying files by entering a text string to a designated URL field. There is now no prima facie case of obviousness, as the claim has a limitation, not shown in Estabrook or Lee. Further, the limitation means that the command must be directed to the action, and not just associated with
25 it.

Claim 47 is currently amended along the same lines, and accordingly, patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 56, the Examiner rejected this claim under Section 103 in view of Estabrook and Lee, equating the claimed *existing program* with the operating system, and
30 holding that the Explorer browser taught by Estabrook (Internet Explorer) is not associated with the operating system. The role of Lee in the rejection was not explained, and Applicant therefore ignores it. Applicant respectfully submits that Estabrook shows that Internet Explorer *is* associated with the operating system. The paragraph "navigate your PC with the address bar", cited by the Examiner, requires as a first step to do "open My Computer", which is a

direct request addressed to the operating system (My Computer is a feature of the operating system). The art describes that opening the browser is the natural behavior of the operating system in response to the request to open My Computer, and that Internet Explorer is the natural interface for directing commands to the operating system. It is respectfully submitted that the limitation "entering a command ... not through a browser interface associated with said program" is not disclosed by Estabrook. Accordingly, no case of prima facie anticipation or obviousness is shown in the Office Action.

New claim 77 depends on claim 56, and relates only to existing programs that are other than the operating system. The feature that the "existing program" is other than the operating system takes the claim one step further away from Estabrook, in relation to the base claim 56.


Support to claim 77 may be found on page 2 lines 1-3 of the application as filed, reading: "Alternatively or additionally, the commands may comprise instructions to the translation system, to the browser itself, to an operating system or other software running simultaneously with the browser on the local computer." [Emphasis added].

Regarding claim 64, the Examiner explains that "every time a page loads the status bar changes" and that this may be considered change in the behavior of the browser. The claim is now amended to make explicit what before was implicit: that the command is *directed to modify presentation of a WWW page*. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited art teaches modifying presentation of a WWW page by entering to the browser a text command.

It should be noted that dependent claims pending in this application are patentable over the independent claims, however to save time, Applicant is not arguing now in respect of the dependent claims.

In view of the above remarks, applicants submit that the claims are patentable over the cited art and the specification fulfills all legal requirements. Allowance of the application is respectfully awaited. If, however, the Examiner is not convinced and the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conversation may forward the present application toward allowance, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned at 1 (877) 428-5468. Please note that this is a direct *toll free* number in the US that is answered in the undersigned's Israel office. Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington.

Respectfully submitted,
Aviv REFUAH



Todd A. SERBIN
Reg. No. 45,087

July 27, 2006

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
250 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10177

Tel: (212) 986-1116